

# **Exhibit C**

---

**From:** Matthias Kamber  
**Sent:** Monday, August 3, 2020 2:31 PM  
**To:** phayes@princelobel.com; Gannon, Kevin; dmcgonagle@princelobel.com  
**Cc:** SINGULAR; Asim Bhansali (abhansali@kblfirm.com); Michael Kwun (mkwun@kblfirm.com); wgs-singularv.google@wolfgreenfield.com  
**Subject:** Singular v. Google - amended answer

Counsel:

I write to follow-up on our meet and confer conversation of Friday, July 31, regarding Google's Amended Answer to Singular's First Amended Complaint. You reiterated your request that Google file a second amended answer. For the reasons stated during our call and in my preceding July 29, 2020 letter, that request is unwarranted. Google has answered Singular's complaint and later amended its answer. Singular apparently wants Google's answer to be *different*, but its concerns are unrelated to the adequacy of Google's pleading under the Federal Rules of Procedure.

During our call, you noted that you intend to move to strike the paragraphs that you have identified and ask the Court to deem those admitted instead. To that end, you noted you had authority in support of that remedy but were unwilling to provide it at the time. So as to evaluate your position, I reiterate my request for law that you believe supports your proposed remedy.

Regards,

Matthias

---

**Matthias Kamber**

Keker, Van Nest & Peters LLP  
633 Battery Street  
San Francisco, CA 94111-1809  
415 773 6635 direct | 415 391 5400 main  
mkamber@keker.com | [vcard](#) | keker.com